

REMARKS

Applicant reviewed the Examiner's arguments set forth on the continuation sheet attached to the Advisory Action dated September 20, 2005, and the Examiner does not appear to substantially elaborate on his previously presented arguments. However, the Examiner does add a few new assertions. For example, in the second full paragraph on the Continuation Sheet, the Examiner states, "Borella does not specifically state that port addresses cannot be translated by Borella. It is evident from column 4, lines 24-29, that this functionality is not explicitly excluded from Borella." In response, Applicant submits that even if, *arguendo*, port information can be converted, such is not disclosed or suggested by Borella. The Examiner appears to have developed his conclusion that converting port information is satisfied by Borella only in view of the present application (i.e., by utilizing impermissible hindsight reasoning). Further, with respect to claim 53, to support the rejection of this claim, the Examiner alleges that, "Borella teaches that the port address is part of the device address. The device can only have an address on an IP network assigned to it upon connecting to the network, or initiating the call." According to Applicant's understanding, however, Borella does not satisfy the particular features of claim 53. That is, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, a device does not have to have an address on an IP network assigned to it upon connecting to the network, or upon initiating the call. An address can be predetermined, and provided to a device prior to the initiation of a call. Therefore, the Examiner's statement regarding claim 53 is not accurate, and Applicant maintains that Borella does not disclose or suggest at least that, "the port is assigned to said first terminal only when said first terminal requests a call initiation," as recited in claim 53.

REMARKS ACCOMPANYING RCE
U. S. Application No. 09/805,362

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62783

In view of the above as well as previously submitted arguments, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 20, 2005